C2

United States
Department of
Agriculture

Economic
Research
Service

May 1982

Policy Research Notes

Issue 13

May '82

82

POLICY RESEARCH NOTES: Published by the Economic Research Service, USDA, and the Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station for professionals in Public Agricultural and Food Policy Research, Teaching, Extension, and Policymaking.

No. 13 Washington, D.C. 20250 May 1982

INTRODUCTION

The signing into law on December 22, 1981, of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 signaled the ending of one cycle of policymaking and the beginning of another. In the next four years, numerous critical decisions will be made in the implementation of the new Act, but long before its termination policymakers will commence discussions about the merits of yet another successor policy. Furthermore, despite the 1981 Act, many important areas of public agricultural and food policy continue to be the focal point of attention: including the Food Stamp Program, soil conservation, dairy policy, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, barge transportation, and international trade negotiations. Thus, policy researchers and educators have continuing responsibilities as well as needs for professional interaction.

Policy Research Notes is distributed to provide a communication linkage among policy workers. It is circulated on a May and November schedule each year. Requests for copies of earlier issues of these Notes and for the latest Policy Workers List, comments or suggestions about them, and proposed contributed articles may be sent to either address below.

CONTENTS

Policy Research Notes is a cooperative effort of the North Central Regional Public Policy Research Committee NC-152 and ERS. The Notes are prepared by R. G. F. Spitze, Department of Agricultural Economics, 1301 West Gregory Drive, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801, and Kenneth C. Clayton, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, ERS, 500 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Thirty-Second NPEEC Program Set

Plans for the next annual Public Policy Education Conference are being finalized. It will be held at Delavan Lake, in southeastern Wisconsin, September 20-24, 1982. Professional workers involved in public affairs education and extension work from all the States and from USDA will be participating.

The program for this year will center around five themes: (1) Domestic Economic Policy--that of the Reagan Administration and alternatives; (2) Roles of the Federal Government in Resource Management--land use, water use, and soil/water conservation; (3) Trade Policy--economic relationships and its development; (4) Changing Roles of Governmental Finance--in State/Federal relationships and impacts on the states of the new federalism. Speakers will address these topics in plenary sessions followed by smaller discussion groups on specific questions.

Further information about the arrangements and attendance may be obtained from the Directors of the Cooperative Extension Service of each State or from the Farm Foundation.

Southern Public Affairs Group Features Conference on Water Policy

A joint workshop between the Southern Extension Public Affairs Committee and the Southern Natural Resources Economics Committee will be held at V.P.I. and S.U., Blacksburg, Virginia on June 7-8, 1982. The theme of the program will be "Emerging Issues in Water Management and Policy."

Topics to be featured at this meeting include: (1) Water Rights and Law in the South; (2) Water Use and Availability in the South; (3) Governments' Roles and Responsibilities in Water Management; (4) Alternative Water Management Strategies; and (5) University's Role in Water Research and Education. A proceedings will be published, supported by the Farm Foundation and the Southern Rural Development Center.

Further information about this workshop may be obtained from C.D. Covey, Chair, Southern Extension Public Affairs Committee, University of Florida and Sandra Batie, Chair, Southern Natural Resources Economics Committee, V.P.I. and S.U.

Project on Policies Amidst Uncertainty Approved by Directors

A new Policy Research Project proposed by the researchers from several regions participating in NC-152, which is scheduled to terminate this year, has been approved by the North Central Experiment Station Directors and is now before the interregional Directors' Committee. Focusing on an "Analysis of Food and Agricultural Policies in an Uncertain Economic Climate," this research is proposed for three years commencing October 1, 1982. Researchers in some seventeen States from all regions and several agencies of USDA have already specified a particular interest in contributing to this interregional effort toward providing current knowledge relevant to the next four-year cycle of policymaking.

Researchers from any station desiring to participate will be given that opportunity through a response from their Experiment Station Director when the approved project is circulated to all Directors in the coming months. For further information about this proposed research effort, contact any present member of the Technical Committee of NC-152, including Marshall Martin, Chairman, Purdue University, and Bob Spitze, Vice-Chairman, University of Illinois.

Small Scale Agriculture Center Established

A Small Scale Agriculture Center was created in 1981 at Pennsylvania State University by its College of Agriculture. Purpose of the Center is to enhance and support activities related to small scale agriculture through the objectives: (1) to support existing programs and faculty in this small scale agriculture-related work; (2) to expand the communications network in small scale agriculture among interested agencies and organizations; and (3) to facilitate increased research and extension programs for small scale agriculture.

Further information may be obtained from Small Scale Agriculture Center, 104 Weaver Building, University Park, PA 16802.

Marketing Administrative Alternatives Project Underway

A national task force has been examining alternatives that public policy administrators might use for various marketing functions in the U.S. agricultural and food sector along with their policy implications. A workshop was held on March 15-17, 1982, in Chicago to review some ten position papers developed by various teams on a broad range of marketing and policy issues including: Alternative Federal Marketing Programs, Regulations, Marketing Orders, Decision Mechanisms, Promotional Programs, Cooperatives and Bargaining, and Price Reporting. Some 30 professional workers from various States, USDA and other Federal agencies participated in this critique. Publication of these papers and follow-up efforts are anticipated.

For further information, contact Walt Armbruster, Farm Foundation, 1211 W. 22nd Street, Oak Brook, IL 60521.

Extension Task Force on Transportation Wins ECOP Approval

A national ECOP (Extension Committee on Organization and Programming) Transportation Task Force has received approval from ECOP's Subcommittee on Community Development and Public Affairs for its proposal to develop an Extension program package in transportation. The proposal calls for the establishment of three national work groups to design transportation educational programs to enhance Extension services in community development, public affairs and agriculture around three broad topics: (1) Rural Passenger Traffic Organization and Management, (2) Rural Freight Traffic Organization and Management, and (3) Transportation Policy and Public Infrastructural Investment. The Extension package will involve educational programming, supporting materials, and training of Extension specialists.

Professional workers are invited to contact the Task Force Chairman for further information or to indicate an interest in participating: Marc A. Johnson (Phone 919-737-2256), Department of Economics and Business, P.O. Box 5576, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27650.

Project on Risk Management

A new regional research project on "An Economic Analysis of Risk Management Strategies for Agricultural Production Firms" has been submitted for approval. Although the orientation of this project is toward firm level issues, it has implications for policy formulation as well. For further information, contact Wes Musser, Department of Agricultural Economics, Conner Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602.

An Integrated Approach to Policy Making in the Food Sector	There is a growing awareness in OECD countries of the need to view the whole range of activities relating to food as a single system. In this study OECD attempts to formulate an integrated approach to policymaking in the food sector and emphasizes three issues: interrelationships between the food sector and the rest of the economy, transparency of policies and the administrative and political framework within which policies are made.
	Inquire about this study from David L. Coutts, Agricultural Policies Division, Directorate for Food, Agriculture, and Fisheries, OECD, 2 rue Andre-Pascal, 75775 Paris, Cedex 16, France, and request two related publications: 1) Food Policy, 1981, order (a charge) from OECD Publications and Information Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006; 2) Food Policy: Country Notes on Germany, Canada, Italy, Japan and Norway, 1981, request in English or French from David Coutts at the above Paris address.
Inquiry Into Improving the Food Policy Formation Process	This inquiry focuses on means of overcoming weakness in food policy formation in poor countries. Distinguishes between policymakers and people who are decisive for policy. Examines the roles of capacity and communication in improving the performance of the food sector.
	Inquire about this project from Charles K. Mann, The Rockefeller Foundation, 1133 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10036 or Malcolm F. McPherson, Harvard Institute for International Development, 1737 Cambridge Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, and request a copy of a related essay, "Improving Food Policy" that appeared in the International Agricultural Development Service Annual Report, 1981, from Charles K. Mann at the above address.
An Inquiry Into Agrarian Reform in El Salvador	A study has been made by a consulting organization at the request of the U.S. Congress about various aspects and consequences of the attempts of agrarian reform in El Salvador.
	Inquire about this project from Don Paarlberg, 1214 Hayes, West Lafayette, IN 47907, and request a copy of the publication resulting therefrom entitled, Agrarian Reform in El Salvador, December 1981, from the Agency for International Development, Office of Development Information and Utilization, Room 509, State Annex 14, Washington, D.C. 20523.
Interrelationships Among Agricultural Technologies, Resources, and the Environment	Research Task 2 of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria, Food and Agriculture Program is concerned with examining the important relationships between agricultural production technologies, resource use, and the environment which will affect the long-run sustainability of the food and agriculture system. A recursive linear-programming econometric simulation hybrid model is used to investigate

these relationships for Iowa. Other case studies are being carried out at IIASA for Hungary, the Sevastopol region of the U.S.S.R., and the Nitra region of Czechoslovakia.

Inquire about this study and request a copy of a preliminary report entitled, Specification of a Regional-National Recursive Model for IIASA FAP's Iowa Task 2 Case Study, July 1981, from Jim Langley or Earl Heady, Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

Food Policy and Farm Programs Published

A volume has been published of 21 essays by economists, political scientists and sociologists. Each essay is an interpretive overview of a particular public program or public policy regarding food and agriculture--e.g., Clawson on soil conservation, Mueller on food conglomerates, Mayer on agricultural trade.

Inquire about this project from the project directors and editors, Don F. Hadwiger and Ross B. Talbot, Department of Political Science, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, and order a copy of a resulting 1982 publication by the same title as above (charge of $6.95) from The Academy of Political Science, 2852 Broadway, New York, NY 10025-0148.

Rationale for Public Agricultural and Food Research

Publicly supported research contributes to improved efficiency in food production and distribution, resulting in lower cost to consumers and a lower tax burden in maintaining food aid programs, and in providing food for the military. A publicly supported nationwide research system is essential because of the widely dispersed and highly specialized character of the food sector. However, improved coordination among States and performing agencies is necessary to prevent unnecessary duplication.

Inquire about this analysis and request a copy of a related article from Feedstuffs 53(June 15, 1981): 30, 32, 34-36, entitled "A Rationale for a Publicly Supported Nationwide System of Agriculture and Food Research," from Joseph C. Purcell, Department of Agricultural Economics, Georgia Experiment Station, Experiment, GA 30212.

Grain Price Level and Volatility in the 1980's Under Alternative Policies

A structural econometric model of the U.S. grain and livestock sector is used to analyze the potential impact of remaining commodity programs on grain price level and volatility during the 1980's. Other policy scenarios analyzed are a continuation of present commodity programs and a farmer reserve consisting of an unrestricted storage subsidy.

Inquire about this research and request a forthcoming Iowa State CARD report by the same title (charge of $3.00) from Andrew Morton, 578E East Hall, Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

Regional-National Econometric Simulation Modeling Project

The objective of this research is to develop an econometric simulation model of regional aggregate supply response in the presence of historic and potential agricultural policy programs. Regional acreage and yield functions are integrated with national price and demand relationships for the major field crops and livestock commodities produced in 11 areas of the United States. The impact of alternative policy scenarios upon important regional and national economic variables is to be studied.

Inquire about this study and request relevant working papers from one of the following researchers: James A. Langley, Raymond Joe Schatzer, Andrew Morton or Earl O. Heady, Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

Alcohol Production from Agriculture: Soil for Oil?

This study investigates the effects of alcohol production from corn grain and corn residue on the U.S. agricultural sector with emphasis on soil loss. The results indicate that by 2000, minimum tillage must be practiced on 40 percent of all land to produce 10 billion gallons of alcohol from corn and maintain soil loss at 2 billion tons per year. Soil loss would increase an additional 20 percent if corn residue was used for alcohol production of 10 billion gallons even when current levels of minimum tillage are doubled.

Inquire about this study from Douglas A. Christensen or Earl O. Heady, Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, and order a related publication, Soil Loss Associated With Alcohol Production (charge of $3.00) from Earl O. Heady at the above address.

Transfer of Agricultural, Food, and Related Technologies

A study has been launched under contract with SEA-USDA as a team effort to extend over a two-year period that will include an examination of linkages between research and extension at se~ected land grant universities.

Inquire about this research from J. Patrick Madden, 3926 Los Olivos Lane, La Crescenta, CA 91214, and request a copy of a related document, Directory of Small Farms Technical Assistance in the U.S., from National Rural Center, 1828 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Agriculture Lobbies and Conservation Issues

Research is underway to examine the lobbying activity of general farm, commodity, and agribusiness interests. The intent is to measure the level and extent to which these firms and groups are involved with long range issues of soil, water, and other conservation concerns as opposed to the short-term economic matters which necessarily dominate most of their time.

Inquire about this research from William P. Brown, Department of Political Science, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859.

Marketing Cooperatives Under Antitrust Law

A review has been made of the state of the antitrust law regarding marketing cooperatives and of public policy defining the scope of exemptions for cooperatives under the Capper-Volstead Act.

Inquire about this project and request a copy of a publication by the above title, USDA ERS-673, February 1982, from Alden C. Manchester, USDA-ERS-NED, Room 246 GHI Building, Washington, D.C. 20250.

Analysis of Major Retail Food Chains

Analysis that builds on previous work to provide a quarter century of information on the economic environment, growth, maturity and present situation of the nation's major public retail food chains has been completed. The implications for producers, consumers, grocery and other retailers, and government regulators are explored.

Inquire about this analysis and request a copy of a publication derived from it entitled, Growth Characteristics of Major Retail Food Chains, 1963-77, Washington State University Agricultural Research Bulletin No. XB0907, 1982, from A. Desmond O'Rourke, Department of Agricultural Economics, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164-6210.

Public Policy and the Beef Industry

Public policy and government programs have a profound impact on the beef industry of both a positive and adverse character. Some policies and programs, such as beef import quotas, were designed specifically to provide some protection for the domestic industry. Other policies, such as the targeted monetary growth with variable and high interest rates, were designed for other purposes but have had an adverse impact on the beef sector. The net impact of various policies on the beef industry have not been as yet adequately quantified.

Inquire about this investigation and request a copy of a paper emanating from it, "The Influence of Public Policy on the Beef Industry," April 1981, from Joseph C. Purcell, Department of Agricultural Economics, Georgia Experiment Station, Experiment, GA 30212.

Organic Farming System Study

An analysis is being made of the factors inhibiting or encouraging a transition from conventional chemical-intensive to organic or natural-biological systems.

Inquire about this analysis from J. Patrick Madden, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

Study of Lifting the Congressional Ban on Agricultural Options Trading

Congress is considering as a part of the reauthorization legislation for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission the lifting of the ban on the trading of agricultural options. This ban has been in effect since the 1930's. A study has been made of this policy issue.

Inquire about this study and request a copy of a related paper published in the Commodities Magazine, January 1982, from James A. Culver, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 2033 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20581.

Farm Cooperative Feasibility in North Carolina

A research project funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has just been completed which examines the economic criteria involved in determining the feasibility of establishing marketing and purchasing cooperatives among low-income farmers in selected North Carolina counties. The research methodology incorporates a quantitative approach to ascertaining the economic viability of farmers' cooperatives.

Inquire about this research and request a copy of a report, The Feasibility of Establishing Marketing Cooperatives Among Low-Income Farmers in Six North Carolina Counties: Report No. 2: Johnston County, 1982, by Basil G. Coley and David R. Williams, by contacting either author at the Department of Economics, North Carolina A&T State University, Greensboro, NC 27411.

Farmer Views on Corn Prices and Marketing

A survey of 1,500 Illinois farmers was conducted in February and March 1982 to find out their views on specific questions relating to corn prices and marketing, check off programs for market development, and interests in joining a corn growers association. This was a joint effort between the Illinois Experiment Station and Illinois Corn Growers Association.

Inquire about this study and request a copy of a forthcoming report, Illinois Farmers View Corn Prices and Marketing, from Harold D. Guither, Department of Agricultural Economics, 1301 West Gregory Drive, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61801.

Agricultural Land Preservation and Water Quality

Research has begun on the relationships between California's water delivery system, water quality in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and the preservation of agricultural land in the Delta by the present system of levees. To be examined are alternative flood protection and reclamation policies and the distribution of the costs and benefits of protecting approximately 450,000 acres of agricultural land. The Delta also is the center of the state's water exchange for water being shipped from northern to southern California. If islands in the Delta were allowed to flood, there would be more salt water drawn in from San Francisco Bay, which would lower the quality of water shipped south as well as the quality of water available to agriculture in the Delta. The project will attempt to examine these interactions and different combinations of public and private sector cost sharing.

Inquire about this research from George E. Goldman or L. Tim Wallace, Cooperative Extension, 319 Giannini Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, and request a copy of a related report, California's Water: Quality, Quantity and The Delta by George Goldman, C. O'Regan, and Tim Wallace from Publications, Cooperative Extension, 319 Giannini Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.

Transportation and Missouri Agriculture

The ninth annual public seminar in a series on issues in agricultural marketing and policy was held at the University of Missouri with a focus on transportation problems in Missouri agriculture. It featured papers and discussion on freight transportation history, policy, potential, financial problems, and alternatives.

Inquire about this education effort and request a copy of the seminar proceedings by the above title from the organizer and contributor to the Seminar, Harold F. Breimyer, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211.

WHAT FARMERS PREFERRED AND WHAT THE 1981 AGRICULTURE AND FOOD ACT PROVIDES

Harold D. Guither*

Background of Survey

During the fall of 1980, agricultural economists in 10 States developed a coordinated research plan to assess farmers' views on public policy issues relative to pending legislation to renew or revise the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977. 1/ A questionnaire was prepared so that farmers in each participating State would be asked the same questions. Only slight variations were made on a few questions to accommodate different commodities and organizations. (Questionnaire appears at the end of this article.) Structured answers were given for most questions for which respondents marked their preferences.

The State statisticians from the Crop Reporting Services in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and Washington assisted in the project by drawing a sample of 1,500 representative farm operators in each of their respective States. In Nebraska a sample of 1,200 was drawn. The questionnaires were mailed during the two weeks following election day, except in Nebraska where they were mailed in early January. Data were processed independently in each State using an identical format so that data comparisons could be made.

The purpose of the survey was to provide an understanding of how farmers viewed certain issues relating to a revision of the 1977 Food and Agriculture Act for the information and use of policymakers, farm organizations, and other interest groups. Survey findings were used by Extension policy specialists for public policy education programs, presented at hearings to members of Congress and to farm organizations and other groups interested in farmers' views on the key issues.

This article will compare selected provisions of the 1981 Agriculture and Food Act with the responses received from farmers in a similar 10-State survey taken a few months earlier.

---

*Professor of Agricultural Policy, University of Illinois.

1/ Research was conducted in the 10 States by Harold D. Guither, University of Illinois; Bob F. Jones, Purdue University; Vern Sorenson, Michigan State University; Martin F. Christiansen, University of Minnesota; Duane Olsen, University of Nebraska; Norbert Dorow, North Dakota State University; Agriculture Carl Zulaf, Ohio State University; J. B. Wyckoff, Oregon State University; Ronald Knutson and H. Vance Young, Texas A&M and Robert Sargent, Washington State University.

Previous Policy Issues Surveys

At least one previous multi-State survey had been conducted to identify farmers' attitudes and preferences on farm policy issues. In November and December 1976, agricultural economists in six States developed and carried out such a coordinated survey. (See Amer. J. Agr. Econ., 60(1978):550-54.) Earlier single State surveys had been made by Breimyer in Missouri, Tweeten and Hatesohl in Oklahoma, and Guither in Illinois.

Findings of Farmer Preferences

Future role of government.--Farmers were asked what they thought Congress should do about future legislation. In each State farmers were divided in their views (see table 1). The most frequent response in each State was to keep the present law with minor changes, varying from 35 percent in Oregon to 53 percent in North Dakota. Only in North Dakota and Minnesota was this the majority response from all respondents. The second most frequent response, to eliminate all price and income support programs, varied from 14 percent in Nebraska to 31 percent in Illinois and Oregon.

Based on the final decisions in the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, which preserved the basic format of the 1977 Act, it appears that the farmers responding to this survey received their preference on future legislation.

Loan rates for corn.--The average loan rate offered to farmers for 1980 corn, not placed in the reserve, was \$2.25 and for 1981 was \$2.40. The average rate recommended by respondents for 1981 for the States involved in the survey ranged from \$2.74 in North Dakota to \$3.07 in Texas. Although the 1981 Act was not as high as the respondents said they wanted in 1981, it was higher than the amount offered in 1980 and 1981.

Target prices for corn.--The average target price offered to farmers for corn was \$2.35 in 1980 and \$2.40 in 1981. Survey respondents recommended an average for 1981 ranging from \$3.01 in Minnesota to \$3.31 in Texas. Although the minimum target prices provided in the 1981 Act of \$2.70 to \$3.18 from 1982 to 1985 were much lower than farmers in this study wanted, they were at least in the preferred direction.

A more significant issue during the writing of the 1981 Act was the question of whether target prices should be eliminated or retained. The Administration at first recommended that they be eliminated.

In each of the 10 States, considerably less than half of the respondents supported the idea of eliminating target prices. The percentages ranged from 13 percent in Washington to 35 percent in Indiana. A substantial portion, ranging from 19 to 30 percent, were undecided on this issue.

Since it was decided to keep the target price and deficiency payment program in the Act, the decision appears to follow the wishes expressed by more farmers than if target prices had been eliminated.

Farmer-held reserve program.--In 8 of the 10 States more farmers agreed than disagreed that the reserve program had been a good one for farmers. From 26 to 49 percent of the respondents in the 10 States had no opinion or did not answer, probably because they had no experience with the program. In all States, more respondents agreed than disagreed that they would like to see the release prices for feed grains raised and set higher than 125 percent of the loan rate, and for wheat higher than 140 percent of the loan rate. A two-price loan plan, one for farmers who took out the regular loan and a higher rate for those who placed grain in the reserve, received mixed reactions. On this issue respondents were about evenly divided in seven States, while more favored than opposed the idea in three States.

Based on the 1981 Act which retained the farmer-owned reserve and provided the Secretary the option of setting the loan rate for reserve corn and the trigger or release price, the views of most farmers seemed to have been reasonably well represented. In similar agreement, the Secretary has announced higher loan rates of $2.90 for reserve corn from the 1982 crop than the $2.55 for regular 9-month loans. Both are higher for the 1982 crop than for 1981.

Reactions to call prices were mixed. A large number of the respondents had no opinion or did not answer. The elimination of the second tier call prices in the 1981 Act seems to be in line with the preferences of most farmers responding to the survey.

Agricultural exports.--A substantial majority of those responding believed that the United States should not limit farm exports for political or foreign policy reasons. Also, in each State, two-thirds or more favored a provision in the 1981 Act that would provide for price protection if exports are limited for any reason. In each State, a majority also favored renewal of the five-year agreement with Russia by which minimum and maximum quantities to be exported are specified.

The 1981 Act provides support at 100 percent of parity if specific embargoes are placed on agricultural commodities to countries which purchased 3 percent or more of the exports of that commodity. However, grain embargoed along with all other exports to a country does not have this price protection. So what the Act does provide is favored by farmers but probably does not provide the total protection that farmers would like to have.

The grain agreement renewal for one year, although not part of the 1981 Act, would be favored by farmers, but most would have preferred another five-year agreement. The current suspension of talks to set up a new agreement would probably not be favored by farmers.

Food stamps.--The food stamp program has little favor with farmers. In nine States more respondents opposed use of public funds to provide food stamps for low-income people than favored it. In three States, where the same question was asked in 1976 and 1980, a decline in support from farmers can be documented. The support

among farmers surveyed for use of public funds for food stamps dropped from 53 to 29 percent in Illinois, from 51 to 26 percent in Indiana and from 56 to 34 percent in Minnesota.

The decision to tighten eligibility requirements and authorize the program for only one year in the 1981 Act is probably in line with the preferences of a majority of farmers in the survey.

Soil conservation.--When asked if farmers should be required to follow recommended soil conservation measures on their farms to qualify for price and income support programs, the responses varied. In eight States more farmers favored such a mandatory compliance program than opposed it. In two States opinions were about evenly divided.

The 1981 Act does require planting of a conserving crop on land placed in the acreage reduction program but does not define such a crop. Further conservation measures are not specified. Although for some, the conservation requirements might not be sufficient, the majority of farmers as represented in the survey would probably favor the direction of the decision.

Agricultural research and extension.--In each State about two-thirds of those responding agreed that more funds should be provided for agricultural research and extension activities. The 1981 Act contained a title dealing with Agricultural Teaching and Extension which supports "adequate" funding and "appropriate" administrative organization. The Administration recommended increased funds for research in the 1981 fiscal year budget. These positions would appear to be in line with the views of survey respondents.

Summary and Conclusions

On none of the issues surveyed, and subsequently covered in the 1981 Agriculture and Food Act, did the new law completely conflict with the preferences of farmers. On most provisions the new Act was in line with the majority of farmers who responded.

Farmers must, of course, compete with other groups for the time and attention of Congress and the Administration in the agriculture and food policymaking process. The Senate Agriculture Committee hearings, for example, received testimony from 34 producer organizations and groups, four farm women's groups, five farmer cooperatives, 45 agricultural business and industry groups, nine consumer groups, three environmental groups, 20 public institutions and officials, three research groups, 15 individual members of Congress, two USDA officials, one Office of Management and Budget representative and five individuals.

The final decisions are usually the result of compromises that attempt to give some consideration to all interested and concerned groups, although seldom giving any single organization or group all that they would like.

Table 1. Preferences for future legislation

What should Congress do in 1981?	IL	IN	MI	MN	NB	ND	OH	OR	WA	TX
					Percent					
Keep present law with minor changes	37	40	47	52	41	53	43	35	36	46
Eliminate all price and income programs	31	26	23	21	14	15	26	31	19	21
Develop new legislation	14	12	11	14	14	16	10	11	12	16
No opinion	10	13	15	5	15	7	12	12	15	10
No answer	8	9	4	8	16	9	9	11	18	7

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

Cooperative Extension Service--Illinois Agricultural Experiment Station
University of Illinois, Department of Agricultural Economics

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES ABOUT AGRICULTURE AND FOOD--TELL US HOW YOU FEEL

1. As a farmer, what do you think would be a fair market price in 1981 for the following?

Corn (per bushel)	$ ______	Hogs (per 100 lb.)	$ ______
Wheat (per bushel)	$ ______	Choice steers (per 100 lb.)	$ ______
Soybeans (per bushel)	$ ______	Milk (Grade A, per 100 lb.)	$ ______

2. The 1977 Food and Agriculture Act provided for target prices for feed grains, wheat, and cotton. Listed below are the national target prices established for 1980 crops. To the right, put your recommendations for target prices for 1981:

	1980	I recommend for 1981
Corn	$2.35	______
Wheat	$3.63	______

3. Listed below are the national average government loan rates for 1980. At the right put your recommendations for loan rates on these crops in 1981:

	1980	I recommend for 1981
Corn	$2.25	______
Wheat	$3.00	______
Soybeans	$5.02	______

4. The Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 is due to expire at the end of 1981. What do you think Congress should do about future farm legislation in 1981? (Check one)

______ Keep the present law and make minor changes in loan rates, target prices, and reserves.

______ Eliminate all government price and income support programs, including the reserve program.

______ Develop totally new farm legislation.
Specify: ______________________________

______ No opinion.

(Continuation of questionnaire)

5. The farmer owned reserve program was a new feature of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977. Check below to show how you view this program:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a. The reserve program has been a good program for farmers since it began in 1978.					
b. The reserve program has been a good program for consumers since it began in 1978.					
c. I would favor discontinuing the target price program and placing more emphasis on the reserve program to support farm prices.					
d. As a producer, I would like to have the release price for feed grains raised above the present 125 percent of loan rate.					
e. As a producer, I would like to have the release price for wheat raised above the present 140 percent of loan rate.					
f. I would like to see a two price loan plan--one for crops not placed in the reserve, and a higher rate for crops placed in the reserve.					
g. Current call prices of 45 percent above the loan for feed grains and 75 percent above the loan for wheat are about right, considering interests of both producers and consumers.					
h. There should be a single release and call price for all producers, no matter when their grain was placed in the reserve.					
6. Limitations of exports to Russia became a major policy issue during 1980. Check below your views on this issue:					
a. At the time, I thought the President was right in limiting exports to Russia.					
b. Based on what has happened, the U.S. should not limit farm exports for political or foreign policy reasons.					
c. The 1981 farm bill should provide price protection for producers if exports are limited for any reason.					
d. The 5-year export agreement with Russia which specifies minimum and maximum quantities, should be renewed when the present agreement expires in 1981.					

Check below how you feel about each statement:

7. Future farm programs should be reoriented to give most price and income support benefits to small and medium size farms with gross annual sales under $40,000.					
8. The present disaster program that applies only to feed grains, wheat and cotton should be replaced by the new all-crop insurance plan in which the government pays part of the premium and the producer pays the rest.					
9. The government should seek agreements with other exporting countries to hold reserves, control production, and raise prices.					
10. The government should use tax funds to buy food stamps for people in the U.S. with low incomes.					
11. The food stamp and other food assistance programs for low income people which now take about 55 percent of the USDA budget should be transferred and administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (formerly Health, Education and Welfare).					
12. To help achieve national and state soil erosion control goals, each farmer should be required to follow recommended soil conservation measures for his farm to qualify for price and income support programs					
13. Foreigners should not be permitted to buy U.S. farmland.					
14. Non-farmers should not be permitted to buy U.S. farmland.					
15. A national board should be established to control marketing of U.S. grain exports.					
16. The government should provide increased funds for agricultural research and extension activities.					

17. For research purposes, we would like to know a little about you and your interests.

a. Your age (please check)

____ Under 30 ____ 30-39 ____40-49 ____50-59 ____60 or older

b. Number of acres farmed in 1980 ________. Acres of: corn ______

soybeans ______ wheat ______

c. In 1980, what percent of land that you farmed did you own? ______ %

d. What will be your most important source of farm income in 1980 (check one)

______grain ______ hogs, beef cattle ______dairy

______about half grain, half livestock ______ other ____________

e. If you or members of your family were employed off your farm in 1980, what percent of your total farm family income in 1980 will come from these nonfarm earnings?

______ less than 25% ______25-49% ______50-74% ______75% or more

f. What was the last year of school you completed?

______grade school ______some high school ______graduated from high school

______some college ______graduated from college

g. Please check your association with these organizations:

	Member in 1980	Not a member now but a member at one time
Farm Bureau	________	________________
Farmers Union	________	________________
Grange	________	________________
National Farmers Organization	________	________________
American Agricultural Movement	________	________________
Pork Producers	________	________________
Cattlemen's Association	________	________________
Milk Producers	________	________________
Corn Growers	________	________________
Soybean Association	________	________________
Labor Union	________	________________

Thank you for answering these questions. All your individual responses will be kept confidential. You need not sign your name. You are welcome to make any comments on the bottom of this page, or on a separate sheet if you want to write more. Please return in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope. It requires no postage.

AGRICULTURE-FOOD POLICY DECISIONS UPDATE

by Richard W. Rizzi*

Table 1--Commodity Program Levels

Commodity	1979	1980	1981	1982
Wheat				
Target price ($ per bu.)	3.40	1/3.63	3.81	2/4.05
Loan level ($ per bu.)	2.50	3.00	3.20	2/3.55
Reserve loan level ($ per bu.)	--	3.30	3.50	4.00
Reserve release level ($ per bu.)	3.75	3/4.20	3/4/4.48	4.65
Reserve call level ($ per bu.)	4.63	5/5.25	5/6/5.60	--
Set-aside/acreage reduction (percent) 7/	20	--	--	15
Diversion (percent)	15	--	--	--
Voluntary reduction (percent)	15	8/	--	--
National program acreage (mil. acres)	67.6	75.0	84.5	9/
Corn				
Target price ($ per bu.)	2.20	1/2.35	2.40	2/2.70
Loan level ($ per bu.)	2.10	2.25	2.40	2/2.55
Reserve loan level ($ per bu.)	--	2.40	2.55	2.90
Reserve release level ($ per bu.)	2.63	2.81	10/3.00	3.25
Reserve call level ($ per bu.)	3.05	11/3.26	6/11/3.48	--
Set-aside/acreage reduction (percent) 7/	10	--	--	12/10
Diversion (percent)	10	--	--	--
Voluntary reduction (percent)	10	8/	--	--
National program acreage (mil. acres)	86.6	83.5	80.5	9/
Sorghum				
Target price ($ per bu.)	2.34	1/2.50	2.55	2.60
Loan level ($ per bu.)	2.00	2.14	2.28	2.42
Reserve loan level ($ per bu.)	--	2.28	2.42	2.75
Reserve release level ($ per bu.)	2.50	2.68	10/2.85	3.10
Reserve call level ($ per bu.)	2.90	3.10	6/3.31	--
Set-aside/acreage reduction (percent) 7/	10	--	--	12/10
Diversion (percent)	10	--	--	--
Voluntary reduction (percent)	10	8/	--	--
National program acreage (mil. acres)	15.3	14.7	14.3	9/
Barley				
Target price ($ per bu.)	2.40	1/2.55	2.60	2.60
Loan level ($ per bu.)	1.71	1.83	1.95	2.08
Reserve loan level ($ per bu.)	--	1.95	2.07	2.37
Reserve release level ($ per bu.)	2.14	2.29	10/2.44	2.65
Reserve call level ($ per bu.)	2.48	2.65	6/2.83	--
Set aside/acreage reduction (percent) 7/	20	--	--	12/10

Continued--

*Richard W. Rizzi is an economist in the Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED, ERS.

Table 1--Commodity Program Levels--Continued

Commodity	1979	1980	1981	1982
Diversion (percent)	--	--	--	--
Voluntary reduction (percent)	30	8/	--	--
National program acreage (mil. acres)	7.8	8.4	10.2	9/
Oats				
Target price ($ per bu.)	--	--	--	1.50
Loan level ($ per bu.)	1.08	1.16	1.24	1.31
Reserve loan level ($ per bu.)	--	1.23	1.31	1.49
Reserve release level ($ per bu.)	1.35	1.45	1.55	1.65
Reserve call level ($ per bu.)	1.57	1.68	6/1.80	--
Set-aside/acreage reduction (percent) 7/	--	--	--	12/10
Diversion (percent)	--	--	--	--
Voluntary reduction (percent)	--	--	--	--
Rye				
Loan level ($ per bu.)	1.79	1.91	2.04	2.17
Soybeans				
Loan level ($ per bu.)	4.50	5.02	5.02	NR
Upland Cotton				
Target price (cents per lb.)	57.7	58.4	70.87	2/71.00
Loan level (cents per lb.) 13/	50.23	48.0	52.46	57.08
Acreage reduction (percent)	--	--	--	15
Diversion (percent)	--	--	--	--
Voluntary reduction (percent)	15	10	--	--
National program acreage (mil. acres)	13.5	11.7	12.8	9/
Extra Long Staple (ELS) Cotton				
Loan level (cents per lb.) 2/	92.95	93.50	99.00	99.89
National marketing quota (1,000 bales)	137	161	195	157
National acreage allotment (1,000 acres)	115.0	131.7	150.2	120.2
Rice				
Target price ($ per cwt.)	13/9.05	13/9.49	13/10.68	2/10.85
Loan level ($ per cwt.) 13/	6.79	7.12	8.01	8.14
Reserve release level ($ per cwt.)	9.51	9.97	--	--
Reserve call level ($ per cwt.)	10.86	11.39	--	--
Acreage reduction (percent)	--	--	--	15
Diversion (percent)	--	--	--	--
National allotment (mil. acres) 2/	1.8	1.8	1.8	--
Flue-cured Tobacco				
Loan level (cents per lb.) 13/	129.3	141.5	158.7	175.9
Effective marketing quota (mil. lb.)	1068	1186	1112	979

Continued--

Table 1--Commodity Program Levels--Continued

Commodity	1979	1980	1981	1982
Effective national allotment (1,000 acres)	577	640	546	546
Burley Tobacco				
Loan level (cents per lb.) 13/	133.3	145.9	163.6	181.3
Effective marketing quota (mil. lb.)	650	769	869	789
Peanuts				
Loan level, quota peanuts ($ per ton) 2/	420	455	455	550
Loan level, non-quota peanuts ($ per ton)	300	250	250	200
Marketing/poundage quota (1,000 tons) 2/	1596	1596	1440	14/1200
Acreage allotment (1,000 acres)	2/1614	2/1614	1734	--
Flaxseed				
Support level ($ per bu.)	4.50	4.50	--	--
Wool				
Support level (cents per lb.) 13/	115	123	135	137
Mohair				
Support level (cents per lb.) 13/	194.3	290.3	371.8	397.7
Honey				
Loan level (cents per lb.)	43.9	50.3	57.4	60.4

NR = Not released.

1/ Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1980, producers who did not stay within their "normal crop acreage" received lower target prices: $3.08 for wheat, $2.05 for corn, $2.45 for sorghum, and $2.29 for barley.

2/ Minimum allowed by law.

3/ The release level for wheat is 140 percent of the loan level. Farmers with contracts specifying 150 percent of the loan level per the January 1980 announcement, may have used a release level of $4.50 per bushel for wheat in 1980 and may have used a level of $4.80 in 1981, or converted their contracts to the 140 percent provision.

4/ The release level for wheat entered into the reserve after July 23, 1981, was set at $4.65 per bushel.

5/ The call level for wheat is 175 percent of the loan level. Farmers with contracts specifying 185 percent of the loan level, per the January 1980 annoucement, may have used a call level of $5.55 per bushel for wheat in 1980 and may have used a level of $5.92 in 1981, or converted their contracts to the 175 percent provision.

6/ On July 24, 1981, the Secretary stated the call level trigger would be used only under an "extreme emergency." This effectively negated call level provisions.

Continued--

Footnotes--Continued

7/ An acreage reduction program was announced for the 1982 crop. This differs from a set-aside in that acreage bases are used, which are determined from actual plantings in the prior year or the average of the two previous years.
8/ The "voluntary reduction" in 1980 is that 1980 planted acreage not exceed 1979 considered planted acreage levels.
9/ Not necessary when an acreage reduction program is in effect.
10/ Feed grains entered into the reserve after October 6, 1981, had the following release levels: corn--$3.15 per bushel; barley--$2.55 per bushel; and sorghum-$3.00 per bushel.
11/ The call level for corn is 145 percent of the loan level. Farmers with contracts specifying 140 percent of the loan level, as per the pre-January 1980 announcement, may have used a call level of $3.15 per bushel of corn in 1980 and may have used a level of $3.36 in 1981 or converted their contracts to the 145 percent provision.
12/ There are two established bases for the 1982 acreage reduction program for feed grains: one for corn and sorghum; the other for barley and oats.
13/ Determined by statutory formula.
14/ The marketing quota was suspended by the 1981 farm bill, but the poundage quota was retained.

Policy Through Administration

Grain and Cotton Programs

1982 Acreage Reduction.--On January 29, the Department announced voluntary acreage reduction programs for the 1982 crops of wheat, feedgrains, upland cotton, and rice to help alleviate the excess supply situation. To participate in the wheat, upland cotton, or rice programs producers must reduce their planted acreage by 15 percent from an established base for each crop. To participate in the feedgrains program, producers must reduce planted acreage by 10 percent from established feedgrain bases. The bases for wheat, upland cotton, and rice will generally be either the higher of the 1981 acreage or the average of the 1980-81 acreages for the specific commodity for each farm. There are two bases for feedgrains: one for corn and sorghum and another for barley and oats. The size for these two bases will also be either the higher of the 1981 acreage or the average of the 1980-81 acreages. If farmers have been following a definite rotation pattern, it will be taken into account when the bases are established. (The authority for acreage reduction programs, rather than set-asides, was granted in the 1981 farm bill).

The reduced acreage must be eligible cropland and protected from wind and water erosion. In addition, the reduced acreage must be devoted to conservation uses and may not be mechanically harvested. However, producers will be permitted to graze this acreage except during the six principal growing months. (Participating farmers must devote cropland equal to 17.65 percent of planted acres to conservation uses for wheat, upland cotton, and rice, and 11.11 percent for feedgrains.) Producers will be able to cut for hay or graze wheat acreage designated for reduction, but previously planted.

Producers must participate in the acreage reduction program to be eligible for other 1982 program benefits such as target prices/deficiency payments, CCC loans, and the wheat and feedgrains farmer-owned reserve (see table 1 for 1982 target prices and loan levels). In addition, 1982 crop wheat and feedgrains will be eligible for immediate entry into the reserve program. Neither cross compliance nor offsetting compliance will be required for the 1982 programs. Producers were able to sign up for the program from February 16 to April 16. A total of 186.3 million acres, or 81 percent of feedgrains, rice, upland cotton and wheat base acreage was enrolled during the sign-up period.

By commodity the base acreage enrolled is as follows:

Corn	-- 61.4 million acres out of	81.5	-- 75 percent
Sorghum	-- 15.2 million acres out of	17.7	-- 85 percent
Barley	-- 9.1 million acres out of	10.4	-- 87 percent
Oats	-- 6.2 million acres out of	10.4	-- 59 percent
Wheat	-- 76.9 million acres out of	90.6	-- 84 percent
Upland cotton	-- 14.1 million acres out of	15.3	-- 92 percent
Rice	-- 3.5 million acres out of	4.0	-- 88 percent

Enrollment does not guarantee participation. Farmers may change their minds up to the time they report their acreage to the local ASCS office.

Deficiency Payments.--Producers received deficiency payments on 1981 crops of wheat, barley, grain sorghum, upland cotton, and rice. Deficiency payments were made because the average market prices received by farmers during the first five months of the marketing year--June through October for wheat and barley, October through February for sorghum, August through December for rice--and the 1981 calendar year for cotton were below established target prices. Wheat producers received 15 cents per bushel--approximately $420 million; barley producers, 11 cents per bushel--approximately $50 million; sorghum producers, 27 cents per bushel--approximately $200 million; rice producers, 28 cents per hundredweight--approximately $22 million; and upland cotton producers, 7.67 cents per pound--approximately $530 million. Producers must have reported their 1981 crop acreage and filed an application to receive deficiency payments. Corn producers were not eligible for deficiency payments on their 1981 crop because the October through February national weighted average price was $2.43, or 3 cents above the target price.

National Program Acreage.--The Department revised the preliminary estimate of the 1981 national program acreages when the deficiency payment announcements were made. The final national program acreage for wheat was increased from 71.0 million acres to 84.5 million and for barley from 9.7 to 10.2 million acres. The national program acreage for corn was reduced from 90.1 to 80.5 million acres, sorghum's was reduced from 15.4 to 14.3 million acres, and that for upland cotton was reduced from 14.0 to 12.8 million acres.

(The national program acreage is that needed to meet domestic demand, exports, and an adequate carryover.) The 1981 allocation factor for wheat and barley was set at 100 percent, while the allocation factor for corn is 97 percent, sorghum is 99 percent, and upland cotton is 93 percent. The allocation factor is determined by dividing the national program acreage by the estimated harvested acreage. It is used in determining the farm program acreage for deficiency payment purposes and ensures that such payments are not made for acreage that is in excess of that needed to meet domestic and export demand plus an adequate carryover.

Loan Program Changes.--The loan maturity dates for a number of commodities have been extended. On March 10, rice producers were given the option to extend their 1981 crop loans, due to expire April 30, to June 30. On March 24, cotton producers were given the option to extend their 1980 crop loans for an additional year. The cotton loans had previously been extended at an interest rate of 11.5 percent. All extended 1980 crop cotton loans will have an interest rate of 12.25 percent.

On April 1, producers holding 1980 crop barley, corn, oats, sorghum, and wheat loans were given the option to extend their loans for one year. Extended 1980 crop loans will be charged a 12.25 percent interest rate. Finally, on April 22, producers with 1981 crop corn and sorghum loans were given the option to extend their loans for an additional six months.

County Loan Rates.--The Department issued county loan rates for 1982 crops of wheat, barley, oats, and rye on April 16 and for corn and sorghum on May 3. The county rates are based on the national average loan level, but vary from county to county to reflect prices received by farmers, transportation costs, and trends in production and consumption.

1982 Rice Loan Rates.--The 1982 rice loan and purchase rates by class, based on the national average loan rate of $8.14 per hundredweight for rough rice, are as follows: $14.75 per cwt. for long grain--up from $14.54 in 1981; $12.75 per cwt. for medium and short grain--down from $12.79; and $5 per cwt. for broken rice--up from $4.70. The differential between the long grain and the medium/small grain loan levels increased by 25 cents per cwt. The premium and discounts schedule was not changed from 1981, but the discounts for location were again increased to reflect current transportation costs.

Cotton Loan Differentials.--On May 3, the Department announced the procedure for determining upland cotton loan differentials for the 1982 crop. The schedule of premiums and discounts for the various grades and staple lengths will be developed by giving equal weight to the schedule for the 1981 crop and to the average premiums and discounts made from August 1981 through February 1982 in nine designated spot markets. For discounts on cotton with micronaire readings above or below the 3.5 to 4.9 range, equal weight will be given to the 1981 crop discounts and to the average discounts made from August

1981 through February 1982 at the spot markets in Memphis, TN; Montgomery, AL; Dallas, TX; and Lubbock, TX. These procedures are the result of recommendations as required by the 1981 farm bill.

Warehouse Contracts and Inspection Fees.--On November 20, the Department delayed from December 1 to January 8 the deadline for approved grain elevators and warehouses to offer extended storage agreements to CCC. As of April 1, the CCC had entered into extended storage agreements for 92 million bushels of space. This represents 302 commercial facilities in 21 States. The space will be used for the storage of wheat, corn, barley, and sorghum.

On December 30, the Department announced an agreement had been reached for the CCC and approximately 1,800 grain warehouses to split the costs of inspecting storage facilities and stored commodities. CCC will pay about 50 percent of the inspection costs for licensed warehouses that have grain or rice storage contracts with the Department. The fees for these inspections will be collected retroactively to October 1, 1981--as required by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.

Alaska's Department of Natural Resources will begin to perform official grain inspection services within the State on June 1. The State agency will not carry out inspections at export port locations. USDA had started these services in Alaska two years ago. The inspection authority is for three years.

ELS Marketing Quotas.--Producers of extra long staple (ELS) cotton approved marketing quotas for the 1982 crop in December. Over 88 percent of the producers voting in the referendum approved of the quota. More than two-thirds of the producers voting had to vote yes for the quota to remain in effect. Quotas have been approved over the past 28 years.

Oilseeds and Tobacco

Soybeans Loan Extension.--On March 29, the Department granted soybean producers an option to extend their 1980 crop loans for an additional year. An increase in the interest rate, from 11.5 percent to 12.25 percent, will apply to all 1980 soybean loans that are extended.

Peanut Poundage Quotas.--On December 1, the Department announced a national peanut marketing quota of 2,043,090 short tons and a national acreage allotment of 1.61 million acres for the 1982 crop. This announcement was required by permanent Federal statutues. However, the 1981 farm bill suspended the allotment and marketing quota authority, although poundage quotas remain. This change in the program allows any farmer to grow peanuts, but only those peanuts produced within a farm's quota will be eligible for government support at the quota rate. In addition, producers may sell only "quota" peanuts for domestic edible use. The poundage quota for 1982 was set at 1.2 million short tons.

Peanut producers approved the poundage quota for the 1982 crop in referendum held during late January. Nearly 94 percent of the voting producers voting voted yes. Because of their affirmative vote, poundage quotas will also be in effect for 1983--1,167,000 tons; 1984--1,134,700 tons; and 1985--1,100,000 tons.

Peanut Support Levels.--The loan and purchase level for 1982 crop quota peanuts was set at $550 per short ton on February 12. The 1981 farm bill required the government to support 1982 quota peanuts at the national average cost of production including land, but at no less than the $550 level. No calculation of cost of production produced a figure higher than the minimum.

Peanuts grown in excess of poundage quotas (additional peanuts) will be eligible for a support rate of $200 per short ton. CCC's 1982 export sales policy provides that the minimum sales price for additional peanuts placed under CCC loan, then sold by CCC for export edible use, be $475 per ton.

1982 Tobacco Loan Rates.--Federal loan levels for the 1982 crop of eligible tobaccos are 10.8 percent above 1981 levels, as determined by statutory formula. They are as follows:

Kind	1982 crop	1981 crop
	Cents per pound	
Flue-cured, types 11-14	175.9	158.7
Virginia fire-cured, type 21	123.0	111.0
Kentucky-Tennessee fire cured, types 22-23	123.0	111.0
Burley, type 31	181.3	163.6
Dark air-cured, types 35-36	109.4	98.7
Virginia sun-cured, type 37	109.4	98.7
Cigar filler and binder, types 42-44, 53-55	90.7	81.8
Puerto Rican, type 46	94.1	84.9
Cigar binder, types 51-52	125.5	113.3

Flue-Cured Tobacco Program.--The national marketing quota for 1982 flue-cured tobacco is the same as for the 1981 crop—1.013 billion pounds—as is the national acreage allotment of 546,386 acres. The quota level is expected to meet domestic and export needs. However, the Department estimates that overmarketings of farm quotas in previous years exceeded undermarketings by 32 million pounds, thereby making the 1982 effective quota equal to about 979 million pounds. Actual marketings from the 1982 quota are estimated to be 940 million pounds, which is down 204 million pounds from 1981.

Burley Tobacco Marketing Quotas.--The 1982 national marketing quota for burley tobacco is 681 million pounds, 3 percent above the 1981 level. However, when adjustments are made for

over and undermarketing the effective farm quota for 1982 is expected to be 789 million pounds.

Tobacco Acreage Allotments.--All 1982 tobacco acreage allotments, except for types 22-24 and flue-cured, were reduced from 1981 levels. They are as follows:

Kind	1982	1981
	Acres	
Virginia fire-cured, type 21	9430	9576
Kentucky-Tennessee fire-cured, types 22-24	26353	26345
Kentucky-Tennessee dark air-cured, types 35-36	11986	13371
Virginia sun-cured, type 37	1320	1335
Cigar filler and binder, types 42-44, 53-55	15194	19048
Cigar binder, types 51-52	3223	3675

Tobacco Referendums.--Nearly 95 percent of producers voting in February favored marketing quotas for 1982 crops of fire-cured (types 21-24) and dark air-cured (types 35 and 36) tobaccos. As a result of the vote, the quota system for these types of tobacco will be in effect for the next three marketing years and eligibility for price support loans will continue.

Puerto Rican Tobacco.--On November 19, 1981, the Puerto Rican tobacco purchase program was terminated due to declining production levels. The program was started in 1967 but has not been used since then. Puerto Rican tobacco producers will continue to be eligible for price supports from two producer associations who act under a loan agreement with CCC.

Nonquota Tobacco.--On March 12, an interim rule went into effect which will treat nonquota tobacco produced in a quota State as quota tobacco starting with the 1982 crop. If marketing quotas are in effect for more than one kind of tobacco in any one State, the nonquota tobacco will count against the quota for the tobacco with the highest support level. There are exceptions to this rule. Nonquota tobacco producers may request AMS to inspect their tobacco to determine if it is "readily and distinguishably different from all kinds of quota tobacco." If this is the case, the tobacco will not be subject to marketing quotas. Maryland, type 32, nonquota tobacco produced in a quota State on a farm for which a marketing quota for type 32 tobacco did exist in 1965 (the last year for such a quota) is also exempt. In addition, certain cigar-filler and cigar-wrapper tobaccos that have never been under quota are exempt.

1981 Cigar Tobacco Loan Rates.--The 1981 crop cigar tobacco loan rates range as follows: for Ohio filler, types 42-44,

from $0.89 for grade X1 to $0.57 for grade N, based on a U.S. average support of 81.8 cents per pound. For Wisconsin, type 54, and New York, Pennsylvania, type 53, from $0.89 for grade X1 to $0.59 for grade N2, also based on a national average support level of 81.8 cents per pound. For Wisconsin, type 55, from $1.10 for grade B1 to $0.52 for grade N2, based on a national average support of 81.8 cents per pound. For Puerto Rican, type 46, from $0.92 for grade C1F to $0.29 for grade N, based on a national average support of 84.9 cents per pound. Finally, for Connecticut, type 51, from $1.42 for grade B1 to $0.81 for grade X1 and for Connecticut, type 52, from $1.38 for grade B1 to $0.81 for grade X1, both based on a national average support of 113.3 cents per pound.

Sugar and Honey

Sugar Price Supports.--On February 19, the Department announced a sugar purchase program. The purchase price for raw cane sugar was set at 16.75 cents per pound (as mandated by the farm bill) and the price for refined beet sugar was set at 19.16 cents per pound. Under the purchase program, the CCC will offer to buy sugar from processors who have agreed to pay at least the minimum support price to any producer who delivers sugar beets or sugarcane to the processor's plant. Only sugar processed from December 22, 1981, through March 31, 1982, is eligible. Purchase agreements may be filed by processors through May 31, 1982, and the processor must inform CCC of their intent to sell by October 1, 1982. No sugar will be officially acquired by CCC before November 1, 1982. This purchase program will be replaced by a loan program on October 1, 1982.

Sugar Import Fees.--The enactment of a domestic sugar price support program had an immediate effect on sugar import fees. On December 23, 1981, by Presidential proclamation, the basic import duty on raw sugar was raised from 0.625 cents per pound to 2.8125 cents--the maximum permitted by law. In addition, the import fee system was temporarily altered by changing the market stabilization price from 15 cents per pound to 19.08 cents.

These actions were taken to protect the domestic sugar program from being undercut by imported sugar. The 15-cent level was established in 1978; the new level represents the domestic price support purchase price--16.75 cents per pound--plus 2.33 cents to cover average freight and marketing costs. As a result of the stabilization price increase, the import fee was raised to 2.1418 cents per pound, up from 1.531 cents for raw sugar and from 2.051 cents to 3.1104 cents per pound for refined sugar. The change in the fee system is authorized by Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and will continue until the International Trade Commission submits a report on the situation.

On April 1, the import fees were raised from the December 23 levels. The levels were increased to 4.1782 cents per pound for refined sugar--up from 3.0014 cents--and to 3.0703 cents per pound for raw sugar--up from 2.1418 cents. This quarterly

action was taken because the average world price for sugar during the 20-day period from February 22 to March 19 had declined to 11.694 cents per pound. The import fees were raised again on April 21 to 5.1782 cents per pound for refined sugar and 4.0703 cents for raw sugar. This action was necessary because the average world price for sugar during the 10-day period from April 1 to April 15 fell to 10.249 cents per pound--a movement of more than one cent from the quarterly base price of 11.694 cents.

The market stabilization price was increased again to 19.88 cents per pound on May 5. In addition, the formula for determining the import fee for refined sugar was changed so that the refined sugar fee would be exactly one cent above the fee for raw sugar. This action lowered the refined sugar fee from 5.1782 cents per pound to 5.0703 cents. The April 21 fee for raw sugar and the May 5 fee for refined sugar will remain in effect until the start of the next quarter (July 1), unless sugar prices rise or fall by at least one cent during a 10-day period.

Sugar Import Quota.--On May 5, an import quota was announced for sugar by President Reagan. From May 11, 1982, to June 30, 1982, only 220,000 short tons of sugar, raw value, will be allowed into the United States. Starting on July 1, the Secretary of Agriculture will establish a sugar import quota for each calendar quarter. The quota will be announced by the 15th day of the month preceding the start of the quarter. As with the May 5 quota, each sugar exporting nation will be assigned a percentage of the quota based on import figures from calendar years 1975 through 1981, excluding the high and low years. This action was taken because the import duties and fees could not be immediately increased, yet the price support program was still in danger of being undercut by imported sugar.

Honey Loan and Purchase Rates.--Loan and purchase rates for the 1982 crop of extracted honey are as follows:

White or lighter	62.4 cents per pound
Extra light amber	59.4 cents per pound
Light amber	56.4 cents per pound
Other table and nontable	54.4 cents per pound

The rates are based on the national average loan and purchase rate of 60.4 cents per pound. To be eligible, the honey must be in 60-pound or larger containers. Producers have until January 31, 1983, to request 1982 crop loans. All such loans will mature on April 30, 1983.

Marketing Order Changes

Marketing Orders.--On January 25, the Department endorsed continued use of Federal marketing orders for fruits, vegetables and specialty crops. (As of January 25, there were 48 Federal marketing order and agreement programs covering 34 commodities grown in 37 States.) However, new guidelines were introduced to clarify certain program operations. These actions are the

result of a study initiated last spring by the President's Task Force on Regulatory Relief and completed in November. The guidelines include a requirement for administrative committees to state the ultimate use of commodities placed in reserve pools under various conditions. Cooperatives are encouraged to refrain from bloc voting on marketing orders or amendments. In addition, procedures are to be developed that will permit the sale of limited quantities of overly ripe, less attractive or blemished produce directly to consumers. The guidelines also call for elimination of provisions that do not allow entry of new producers and states that volume controls should not be used to encourage chronic overproduction or restrict competition.

With 71 percent of eligible producers voting during October, the California and Arizona naval orange growers approved continuation of the Federal marketing order for their crop. Approximately 91 percent of those voting wanted continuation of the order that has been in existence since 1953. On November 19, the Department announced its intention to increase monitoring activities of the prorate provisions of the navel orange marketing order. This will be accomplished through analysis of each weekly recommendation for the total quantity (prorate) of navel oranges which may be handled during the following week to see if the level is justified.

Inspection Fees.--On June 10, 1982, the fees for voluntary inspection of processed fruits, vegetables, and related products will be increased by approximately 9 percent. The new base fees will be $24.00 per inspector hour for regular inspection--up from $22.00--and $29.00 per inspector hour for overtime work--up from $27.00. If the inspection personnel are assigned by contract on a year-round basis, the fee will be $19.00 per hour--up from $17.00. For personnel assigned by contract on less than a year-round basis the fee will be $21.00 per hour--up from $19.00. (All overtime rates will be the base fee plus $5.00 per hour.) The fee for in-plant contract inspection services on a less than a year-round basis will be $26.00 per hour--up from $24.00.

Other Decisions.--Beginning January 1, all processing firms purchasing potatoes grown within the same State were required to obtain a license under the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA). This regulation was required by an amendment passed by Congress in November 1978.

The Department made grade standards available for canned celery on February 9 and gladiolus bulbs on April 4. In addition, grade standards for applesauce and canned apple juice were revised on March 11. All of these actions were requested by affiliated industry groups.

Following the recommendations of a task force, the Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission decided not to require written contracts for interstate movement of agricultural commodities that are otherwise exempt from regulation.

The task force found that a mandatory contract of haul could cause problems for some agricultural products such as fresh fruit, with no real benefits being obtained by truckers.

Alaska became the 49th State to sign a cooperative agreement with USDA to have grading services for fresh fruits, vegetables, and nuts at terminal markets on November 13. State inspectors will do the actual grading, while the Department establishes procedures and supervises the program.

Livestock Programs

1981 Wool and Mohair Payments.--In 1981, the national average market prices for shorn wool--94.5 cents a pound--was below the shorn wool support price--$1.35 per pound. Therefore, sheep producers became eligible for Federal incentive payments on the wool they sold in 1981. Approximately $41.9 million will be paid to sheep producers compared to about $36 million paid out for 1980 marketings. The actual payment rate is determined by dividing the difference between the support price and the average market price (equal to 40.5 cents) by the average market price. The 1981 payment rate is 42.9 percent compared to 39.6 percent in 1981. This rate is then multiplied times the net dollar return each producer received from wool sales. (This program encourges high quality production since the amount a producer receives from sales determines the size of the payments.) In addition, sheep producers will receive $1.62 per hundredweight in Federal payments for unshorn lambs sold or slaughtered in 1981 as compensation for the wool on such animals.

For the first time since 1971, mohair producers will receive Federal incentive payments. The 1981 average market price for mohair was $3.50, slightly below the support price of $3.72. The payment rate for 1981 marketings of mohair is 6.3 percent. The payment rate and actual payments are determined in the same way as for wool.

Emergency Feed.--On April 8, the emergency feed program was terminated. This action was taken to save funds; however, the pro ram may be reactivated if conditions warrant such action. Applications filed after March 9 will be eligible for funds if approved, but assistance will be limited to livestock feed purchased no later than March 9 and on hand when the application is filed. No application filed after April 8 will be processed.

Meat Inspection and Grading.--On November 29, the Department increased its fees for grading and certification of livestock traded in commodity markets. The new fee for work performed Monday through Friday between the hours of 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. is $23.20 per hour, up from $20.00. For work performed on weekends and after hours on weekdays, the fee is $28.20 per hour, up from $23.20. Finally, the fee for work performed on legal holidays is now $46.40 per hour, up from $40.00. This service is used on livestock deliveries to settle futures contracts for the Chicago mercantile and Mid-America commodity exchanges and on livestock financed through the CCC for export.

On March 29, USDA officially assumed responsibility for the compliance functions of the Federal meat inspection programs in Arkansas, Michigan, Idaho, and Rhode Island. In addition, the poultry inspection program was assumed in Rhode Island. USDA had assumed responsibility for inspecting slaughter and processing plants in these States in 1981. This additional action forces firms handling meat and poultry outside the Federally-inspected plants to register with the Department and be subject to recordkeeping and other requirements. South Carolina asked USDA to assume responsibility for its State meat and poultry inspection programs effective February 22. However, in late February, South Carolina informed the Department that it would continue funding its own program.

Brucellosis Program Changes.--The Department postponed the implementation of the new cattle brucellosis rating system from January 1 to May 1. This action was taken to allow data for individual States to be further examined so that each State would be properly rated. Every State now has a cattle brucellosis classification. (A dual rating is possible within a State if conditions permit control of the disease within set areas.) There are four possible classifications--"free", "Class A", "Class B", and "Class C." A State rated "free" has had no instance of infected herds for at least 12 months. Class A States are those with herd infection rates no higher than .25 percent; Class B States have infection rates of .25 to 1.5 percent; and Class C States have infection rates of more than 1.5 percent. Cattle producers in States with lower ratings must comply with more testing and certification requirements before moving certain types of cattle than do producers in States with a higher rating.

On February 25, the Department implemented a new three-stage method for validating States as free of swine brucellosis. A State that has carried out all program requirements to eliminate the disease and has no known infections is designated Stage III (previously known as "validated free"). Stage II States are those that are properly handling known infected or suspicious herds, including the use of quarantines and prompt removal of tested infected animals. Stage I States test slaughtered breeding swine at slaughter for brucellosis, if slaughtering facilities exist, identify test-eligible swine, and have a system in place for reporting test results on swine from out of State. Nine States have limited programs or no programs, thereby not qualifying for Stage I.

Imports of Mares from CEM Nations.--Under regulations announced on October 16, 1981, for the first time since the fall of 1977, importation of certain breeding age mares from nations affected by contagious equine metritis (CEM) became possible. Treatments and a series of negative tests are required prior to shipment to the U.S. (On April 29, the Department issued a regulation that will allow such mares to receive surgical treatment in the U.S. if it was not adequately performed in the originating nation.) The animals are then consigned to eligible States for

quarantine, additional treatments, and tests. All tests must prove negative before the quarantine is lifted. On December 23, Kentucky and Virginia became the first States to become eligible to handle such mares. New York was added to the list on February 10; South Carolina and Colorado were added on April 7.

International Livestock Action.--On December 30, USDA announced that Great Britain had regained its foot and mouth disease-free status. This ruling made Great Britain eligible to ship ruminants, swine and British-produced meats of those livestock to the U.S. An outbreak of the disease on the Isle of Wright in March 1981 had barred such shipments. On March 27, 1982, the U.S. banned the shipment of Danish cattle, swine, sheep, goats, other hooved animals, dairy products, and fresh, chilled, or frozen meats because of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease on the Danish island of Fyn. (Hard cheese and shelf-stable canned or cured meats are not affected.)

Fees for importing cattle from countries affected with foot and mouth disease will be divided into two parts. One part will be for preliminary testing while cattle are kept in on-farm isolation in the originating nation, while the other part will be for the U.S. quarantine. With this system importers will not have to pay fixed costs for animals refused entry.

The first and second quarter estimates of U.S. meat imports for 1982 were both below the level that would require restraints on such imports under the Meat Import Act of 1979. The December 28 estimate for imported beef and certain other meats during 1982 was not more than 1,210 million pounds, while the March 31 estimate was 1,175 million pounds. Both levels are below the 1982 trigger point of 1,300 million pounds.

Other Livestock Regulation Changes.--The Department increased the retail sales exemption for meat and poultry inspection on March 22. Federal law requires all wholesale meat and poultry operations to be inspected. However, retailers may sell to households without inspection. In addition, retailers may sell to hotels, restaurants, and similar "nonhousehold" consumers within certain limits and remain exempt from inspection. The limit on a retailer's annual sales to non-household consumers was increased to $28,000 from $27,000 for meat and to $23,100 from $22,200 for poultry. This annual adjustment is automatic during the first quarter of a calendar year if fluctuations in the Consumer Price Index indicate that the price of meat and poultry products have changed more than $500 during the previous year. A retailer still must have at least 75 percent of total annual sales originating from household consumers.

To simplify selling, transporting, and marketing of certain meat products, the Department has announced that certain forms will no longer be required. Starting May 24, two shipper's certificates will no longer be required for transporting U.S. inspected and passed meat and meat food products. Also, a special permit will no longer be needed to return alleged

adulterated or misbranded meat products to the originating plants. Instead, the Federal supervisor in the area where the plant is located will be responsible to give oral permission. Finally, the shipper's certificate for inedible meat or meat food products was eliminated since required denaturing or proper labeling identifies the product as inedible.

Natural Resource Programs

Grazing Fee Changes.--The Forest Service has lowered the fees it charges for grazing livestock on national grasslands and forests. The 1982 grazing fee on national forest land in the 16 western States is $1.86 per animal month, down from $2.31 in 1981. (An animal month equals grazing one cow, one horse, or five sheep for one month.) The 1982 grazing fee on national grasslands in the 9 Great Plains States will be $3.34 per animal month, down from $3.56. In both cases, a statutory formula based on comparisons of costs of grazing livestock on public and private lands, beef cattle prices, leasing rates of private lands, and cost of producing livestock in the affected States, is used to set the fee. In addition, the grazing fee on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management will be $1.86 per animal month.

Forest Service Payments.--On December 4, the Forest Service announced that a total of $230 million was to be paid to 40 States and Puerto Rico. These payments represent the States' share--25 percent--of the revenues collected by the Agency for land use charges in national forests. The Forest Service had made an interim payment of $171 million on October 1; therefore, the December payments totaled $59 million. The payments are to be used for public schools and roads.

On February 25, the Forest Service made payments totaling over $12 million to the 20 States that have national grasslands or land utilization projects. As with the national forest program, these payments are the States' share--25 percent--of fees collected for various land uses.

On March 1, the Forest Service estimated the States' share of national forest land use charges for 1982 would be approximately $193 million. In addition, 20 States would receive a share of national grasslands and land utilization projects receipts. This payment is estimated at over $11 million for 1982.

Soil Conservation Program.--The Department has begun a new agricultural conservation program which targets critical problem areas for intensified soil erosion or water conservation efforts. This concept allows all levels of government and farmers to coordinate actions in certain areas, while maintaining established conservation efforts on other lands. For fiscal year 1982, $9 million has been earmarked for the program. These funds will be used in targeted areas in 15 States. Three- to five-year agreements will be emphasized in the program.

Timber Sale Policy.--The Forest Service on April 15 made some changes in the procedures for selling national forest timber. The changes were made to reduce speculative bidding for such

timber, speed the flow of cash from timber sales to Federal and local governments, provide for a more prompt and orderly harvest, and reduce the need for contract extensions. The new procedures require bidders to supply a bid guarantee worth 5 percent of the advertised value of the contract. This guarantee will be forfeited if the high bidder fails to make the required initial cash deposits, provide the performance bond, or does not execute the contract within a specified time. The maximum required performance bond will be $500,000. For any sale of more than 3 years' duration the purchaser must have paid either 50 percent of the bid premium or 25 percent of the anticipated contract price by the end of the normal operating season following the midpoint time of the contract. In addition, for any contract expansion, the purchaser now must pay in cash for any government costs caused by the harvesting delay, including the full cost of government interest. For contracts with stumpage rate adjustment, the purchaser must also pay for timber removed from the area during the extension at rates no lower than the tentative rates established during the extension period.

On May 7, the Department altered the payment procedure on extended timber sale contracts. On national forest timber sales contracts extended since 1980, timber purchasers may defer payments by paying interest on the unpaid price for the period of the extension. Prior to this change, the purchaser had to make monthly deposits on the contracts regardless of whether the timber was harvested or not.

Residence Values Reappraisal.--The Forest Service changed its method of reappraising the value of recreation residences on National Forest lands on January 1. The land now will be reappraised every 10 years instead of every five. User fees will be adjusted annually based on changes in the CPI, rather than after the five-year appraisals. Approximately 16,000 special use permits are issued for recreation residences.

Pest Control

Fruit Fly.--The Department announced on November 13 the Mediterranean fruit fly had been eradicated from Florida and all quarantine restrictions were removed from the affected Florida area. Meanwhile, the winter months brought on a reduction in activity in the effort to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly from California. The area scheduled for treatment was reduced to 210 square miles--down considerably from 1,300 square miles at the height of the infestation--and the spraying was conducted on a bi-weekly schedule, rather than weekly. With warmer weather, the treatment program will be expanded where necessary.

In January, Japan agreed to relax some of its import restrictions placed on U.S. produce exports because of the fruit fly problem. Instead of requiring all California produce to be fumigated before shipment, Japan agreed to accept California produce if it is cold-treated or fumigated in transit to Japan. In addition, Japan agreed to accept all lemons from counties not under USDA regulation without treatment until April 10 if they were shipped in order to prevent infestation in transit.

The Department began to allow some citrus fruit from Texas' Rio Grande Valley to be shipped without fumigation to eliminate the Mexican fruit fly on November 2, 1981. However, this allowance was halted on January 21, after a female Mexican fruit fly was trapped in the affected area. All citrus fruit from the Valley again fell under fumigation procedures.

Fire Ant Quarantine.--New areas of 70 counties in AL, AR, GA, MS, NC, SC, and TX have been added to the Federal quarantine to prevent the spread of imported fire ants. The quarantine restricts the movement of soil, nursery stock with attached soil, grass sod, hay, straw, and other articles that could artificially spread imported fire ants, unless such products are inspected and treated.

Gypsy Moth Program.--On April 28, additional parts of five States were added to the "high risk" list for gypsy moth regulated areas. Regulated articles and products, such as recreational vehicles, must be inspected and treated, when necessary, before moving from a high risk to an unregulated area. The Federal Government doubled its 1982 funding for controlling gypsy moth infestations on May 13. The Federal Government will now contribute about $3.6 million, or 25 percent, of the total cost of the program.

Finance

14.5
Dec 31
Jan 1 1982 12.25

CCC Loans.--On January 1, CCC began adjusting its interest rates on loans, including commodity and farm storage facility loans, on a monthly basis. This represents a change from the semiannual adjustment mechanism that started on April 1, 1981. All loans disbursed since April 1, 1981, with interest rates subject to change, had their interest rates adjusted on January 1 from 14.5 percent to 12.25 percent. This rate will remain in effect until January 1, 1983, for all applicable CCC loans made from April 1, 1981, to January 30, 1982. The interest rate for CCC loans made in February 1982 was 14.0 percent, in March 1982 14.875 it was 14.875 percent, in April 1982 it was 13.875 percent, and in May it was 14.125 percent. All of these interest rates will remain in effect until January 1983 when all CCC loans, with interest rates subject to change, will be assessed the January 1983 rate.

14.5
12.25
14
14.875
13.875
May 14.125
June
July 14
Aug 12
Sep
1983 Jan

FmHA Loans.--On January 1, 1982, the interest rate for FmHA community facility and water and waste disposal loans was lowered from 12.25 percent to 11.375 percent. However, on April 1 the rate increased to 12.37 percent. These quarterly changes are based on current average costs of municipal bonds.

On February 5, additional changes were made in FmHa interest rates. The interest rate for insured operating loans was lowered from 14.50 percent to 14.25. The rate for limited resource operating loans was reduced from 11.50 to 11.25 percent, while the limited resources loan rate was lowered from 7 percent to 6.625. However, the interest rates for annual production loans and operating adjustment loans under the disaster emergency program were raised from 15 to 16 percent. The divergence in actions was caused by differing benchmarks for basing the rates.

Those that were lowered are based on cost to the U.S. Treasury of borrowing money, while those that were increased are based on the costs of comparable loans in the private market.

In December, FmHA initiated changes in its home loan program which made more persons eligible to obtain FmHA single-family home loans. The most important feature is the elimination of the single, nationwide income eligibility standard. Income eligibility ceilings are now based on area median income with low income defined as 80 percent of the median. Very low income levels are those at 50 percent or less of the median. At least 30 percent of the housing loans must be made to borrowers in the very-low income category, if practical. Income eligibility now ranges from $17,000 to $23,500 ($33,000 in Alaska) with interest credit eligibility ranging from $11,500 in some areas to $18,000 in others.

The authority for FmHA to make loans in rural areas of 10,000 to 20,000 people was continued indefinitely on March 19. FmHA is usually limited to making housing assistance loans in areas of up to 10,000 people. The Secretaries of Agriculture and Housing and Urban Development can make an exception if they agree a serious shortage of mortgage credit exists in the more populous areas. At no time may this assistance be provided in SMSAs. The authority was due to expire on March 31.

REA Sells Tax Write-Offs.--On November 12, the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) allowed two REA-financed power cooperatives to sell the rights to $280 million in tax credits and depreciation write-offs to the General Electric Company. Such sales are allowed under the Economic Recovery Act of 1981 and this represents the first time REA-financed operations have taken such action. The sales will result in approximately $49 million in revenue for the co-ops.

Farm Storage Facility Loans.--The authority to approve applications for farm storage facility loans was temporarily suspended on February 8. However, processing of previously approved applications continued. On April 2, the suspension was lifted for loan requests made on or before February 8. Such applications may be approved by local ASCS county committees if all qualifications are met.

Nutrition Programs

Cheese Distribution.--On December 22, President Reagan authorized the distribution of a limited amount of government-owned cheese. A total of 100 million pounds of cheese in five-pound blocks became available for distribution between December 22 and July 1, 1982. States must make a request to otain an allotment of cheese. The cheese can either be distributed through food banks for household consumption or it may be used in various nutrition programs.

Food Stamp Changes.--On December 28, the Department announced that most food wholesalers would no longer be authorized to accept and redeem food stamps. At the time the new rule was issued there were 2,300 wholesalers authorized to receive food

stamps. The only wholesalers that will now be authorized to participate in the program are those needed to serve treatment programs for alcoholics or drug addicts, group living arrangements for the blind or disabled, and shelters for battered women and children. Wholesalers in these cases will only be allowed to accept food stamps in exchange for food. In addition, wholesalers will be authorized, when needed, to redeem food stamps from retail food outlets which have no access to a bank and from specific nonprofit cooperative food purchasing ventures. This action was taken to reduce the potential for program abuse.

The Department approved Puerto Rico's plan to replace the food stamp program with a cash assistance grant on April 23. Starting July 1, Puerto Rico will receive an annual nutrition assistance grant to meet food assisance needs. This program and the initial funding of $825 million annually was authorized by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.

International Programs

Export Credits Withheld.--Because of the Polish government's imposition of martial law in mid-December, the Federal Government began to hold new credits for Poland for food in abeyance. This action did not affect food supplies already earmarked for delivery to Poland or non-credit sales.

On April 30, the Federal Government announced that CCC loan guarantees to Argentina were being suspended because of the Falkland crisis. This will affect about $2 million in guarantees granted to Argentina on December 29, 1981, but like the Polish action, non-credit sales were not affected.

U.S.-USSR Consultations.--As a result of the situation in Poland the talks on a new long-term grains agreement between the U.S. and USSR were postponed indefintely in December. However, under terms of the existing U.S.-USSR grains agreement, the Department on April 16 announced that U.S. and USSR grain teams would meet to review world, U.S. and Soviet grain situations and prospects on May 21 and 22 in Paris.

Barter Agreement.--On February 25, the U.S. and Jamaica signed a barter agreement in which the U.S. would trade $13 million worth of dairy products for an equal amount of Jamaican bauxite. (This translates to 7,238 tons of nonfat dry milk and 1,905 tons of anhydrous milk fat for 400,000 tons of bauxite.) This is the first barter agreement involving USDA since 1967. The bauxite is part of a total 1.6 million tons the U.S. is acquiring from Jamaica for the national defense stockpile. The remaining bauxite is being obtained by the General Services Administration.

Caribbean Basin Committee.--The Department has established an agribusiness advisory committee to assist in carrying out the agricultural development aspects of the Caribbean Basin Initiative. In addition to advising the Department on policies and programs involving private concerns in encouraging development, the Committee will help establish an International Agribusiness

Center within the Office of International Cooperation and Development. The Center will provide expanded services, such as organizing agricultural investment missions to the Caribbean basin, for agribusinesses.

Other International Action.--The U.S. has signed agreements with Australia, West Germany, and France to exchange scientific and technical teams and information. The agreement with Australia centers on natural rubber research, while the French and West German agreements cover various areas of research. In addition, the U.S. will continue to take part in cooperative agricultural projects in Mexico. In 1982, 17 projects in Mexico, examining a wide variety of subjects from animal diseases to pasture improvement programs will be jointly funded. Finally, the exchange of scientific teams between the U.S. and China will continue in 1982.

On December 2, an agreement was signed which will continue USDA commitment to the International Science and Education Council through 1985. This Council coordinates programs of international agricultural scientific cooperation and development carried out by colleges and universities.

Departmental Changes

Publication Policy.--Adopting the recommendations of a Departmental paperwork task force, over 500 USDA publications have been eliminated. In addition, a new publication management system has been established within the Department. This system will increase efforts to reduce publications at the agency level; require all new publications or reprints of existing publications be approved at the Under-Secretary or Assistant Secretary level; and make the task force a permanent unit to be called the Secretary's Review Board.

Another result of the recommendations is the imposition of user fees for all publications beginning October 1, 1982. On May 1, the Economic Research Service began charging for its publications to save funds during fiscal year 1982. The Statistical Reporting Service and the World Agriculture Outlook Board are scheduled to follow ERS' lead on June 1. In all cases, a limited number of publications will be available to news media, land-grant universities, and others.

Agency Changes.--The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has been transferred from the supervision of the Under-Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs to the Under-Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development. The move was made to group together all agencies offering essential financial programs.

Two Departmental regional information offices were closed on March 31--Dallas and New York. These two offices had been providing information services for the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS), the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), the

Federal Grain Inspection Service (FGIS), Packers and Stockyards Administration, and the Office of Transportation. Information for AMS and APHIS will now be available from regional offices in Atlanta, Chicago, and San Francisco. Information for the other four agencies will be available only from their Washington, D.C., offices.

Other Changes.--The Departmental test on market news reports for various commodities on a direct-dial telephone basis ended April 1. InfoLine was tested by AMS in conjunction with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. The service had no cost to the government, while the users were charged 50 cents per call. A lack of public use caused the discontinuation. Regular AMS instant market reports on commodities will continue.

Policy Through Legislation

1981 Farm Bill

The Agriculture and Food Act of 1981, Public Law 97-98, was signed by the President on December 22, 1981. This Act provides a framework within which the Secretary of Agriculture will administer agricultural and food programs during the next four years. In addition, substantial new authority is granted to the Secretary to issue regulations and implement various provisions when needed. The major provisions are summarized below:

Commodity Provisions.--Most of the commodity provisions apply to the 1982 through 1985 crop years. Some of these include the following:

Loan Programs.--Minimum support levels are established for wheat and feed grains; no mandatory adjustment mechanism is included. The upland cotton and rice loans will be determined in the same way as they were for the 1977 Act, as amended. The peanut loan will have a minimum level for the 1982 crop, but it must be set to reflect changes in the cost of production. For 1983 through 1985, the peanut support adjustment may not exceed 6 percent in any year. A new sugar loan and purchase program is initiated with minimum levels established. The soybean loan program is continued.

Target Prices.--The target price/deficiency payment program is continued for wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice. Minimum target price levels are set for all crops. The Secretary is given authority to adjust the wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice targets by changes in cost of production. The upland cotton target must be set at either the higher of the minimum level, plus any adjustments made for changes in production costs, or 120 percent of the loan level.

Acreage Reduction.--The Secretary is authorized to use either an acreage limitation or a set-aside program to reduce the acreage planted to wheat or feed grains, if needed. The acreage limitation program, but not the setaside, is available to reduce the acreage planted to upland cotton or rice. Paid land diversion authority is also continued for wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice.

Allotments and Quotas.--Provisions relating to rice acreage allotments and marketing quotas are repealed. Peanut acreage allotments are suspended for crop years 1982 through 1985. However, the poundage quota for peanuts remains. Producers holding peanut allotments in 1981 will receive a poundage quota.

Grain Reserves.--The farmer-owned reserve program is continued. The program's operating regulations will be determined by the Secretary.

Export Provisions.--The Agricultural and Trade Development and Assistance Act (P.L.-480) is extended through December 31, 1985. Its self-help provisions have been expanded and strengthened to assure that receiving nations work to improve their economic, agricultural, and social development. Authorization for an export credit revolving fund is also provided.

Embargo Protection.-- Embargo protection is substantially broadened to alleviate adverse effects of embargoes. Producers will be eligible for either higher loans and/or special payments if an embargo is announced for national security or foreign policy reasons.

Other Provisions.--Some other 1981 Act provisions include authorization for the food stamp program, with modifications, to continue for one year. Research, extension, and teaching programs are authorized to continue through fiscal year 1985. New resource conservation programs, geared more toward special areas, are established. Finally, a cost of production review board and a floral research and consumer information board (Floraboard) are established.

(Single copies of Provisions of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (AER-483) are available from Tom Fulton, ERS/NED, Room 120, GHI Bldg., 500 12th Street, S.W., Washington D.C. 20250.)

Other Action

P.L. 97-77 delayed an increase in the price support for milk from November 15, 1981, to December 31, 1982. In addition, the wheat and cotton referendums on marketing quotas, required by permanent legislation, were delayed until January 1, 1982. The passage of the 1981 farm bill negated the need for the referendums and delayed the adjustment in the dairy support price until October 1, 1982.

POLICY RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE

ARMBRUSTER, WALTER J. (ed.) Proceedings From the Perspectives on Food and Agricultural Policy Research Workshop. May 1982.

Request a copy of this publication from the Farm Foundation, 1211 West 22nd Street, Oak Brook, IL 60521.

BAJWA, RAJINDER. Irrigation in Humid Regions--An Annotated Interdiciplinary Bibliography. NRED Staff Report AGES820218, 38 pp., Mar. 1982.

Request a copy from Rajinder Bajwa, Water Branch, NRED/ERS/USDA, 417 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., Washington, DC 20250.

BANKER, DAVID E. POLYSIM: Users Guide and Description. NED Staff Report AGES811209, 179 pp., Dec. 1981.

Request a copy from David Banker, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED/ERS/USDA, 112 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

BARROWS, RICHARD, and CAROL OLSEN. "Soil Conservation Policy: Local Action and Federal Alternatives," Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. November-December 1981.

Request a reprint of this article from the senior author, 350 Agriculture Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706.

BLUESTONE, HERMAN and REID, J. NORMAN. Business and Industrial Loan Guarantees, A Review of the Implicit Development Strategy, 1977-79. EDD Staff Report AGES811222, 18 pp., Jan. 1982.

Request a copy from Herman Bluestone, Community Resource Branch, EDD/ERS/USDA, 494 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

BOCK, C. ALLEN, and DAVID L. CHICOINE. Taxation: Federal, State and Local Systems. Illinois Agricultural Economics 4523. December 1981. 43 pp.

Request this report from David L. Chicoine, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, 305 Mumford Hall, 1301 West Gregory Drive, Urbana, IL 61801.

BREIMYER, HAROLD F. Agriculture and Energy: The Interlocking Puzzle. Missouri Agricultural Economics Paper No. 1982-4.

Request a copy of this speech from Harold F. Breimyer, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211.

BREIMYER, HAROLD F. Government, Agriculture, and the Rural Community in the 1980's, Missouri Agricultural Economics Paper No. 1982-10; and Prospects for the Economy: An Interpretation, Missouri Agricultural Economics Paper No. 1982-18.

Request copies of these speeches from Harold F. Breimyer, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211

BREIMYER, HAROLD F. The Need for an Equity Emphasis in Agricultural Transportation Policy. Missouri Agricultural Economics Paper No. 1982-14.

Request a copy of this speech from Harold F. Breimyer, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211.

BROWNE, WILLIAM P., and DON F. HADWIGER (eds.). Rural Policy Problems: Changing Dimensions.

Order this book (charge unknown) from Lexington Books, D. C. Heath, 125 Spring Street, Lexington, MA 02173, expected publication date July 1982.

CARTER, HAL (ed.). "Food Security in a Hungry World." Proceedings of International Food Conference. April 1982.

Order this publication (charge of $20) from Ms. Terry Furst, Ellen Newman Assoc., 323 Geary Street, San Francisco, CA 94102.

CARLIN, THOMAS A. and COLTRANE, ROBERT. Employment and Population Growth in Nine Nonmetro Kentucky Counties. EDD Staff Report AGES811210, 20 pp., Jan. 1982.

Request a copy from Thomas Carlin, Human Resources Branch, EDD/ERS/USDA, 492 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., Washington, DC 20250.

CATE, PENELOPE. A Description and Chronology of Embargoes, Moratoriums and Suspensions of U.S. Agricultural Exports Since 1970. Report No. 81-235 ENR. October 1981.

Request a copy of this report from the author, Food and Agriculture Section, ENR/CRS, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540.

CHICOINE, DAVID L., and JOHN T. SCOTT, JR. Assessing Farmland in Illinois. April 1982, 59 pp.

Request this paper from David L. Chicoine, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, 305 Mumford Hall, 1301 West Gregory Drive, Urbana, IL 61801.

CHRISTENSON, LEE, and MIRANOWSKI, JOHN. Perceptions, Attitudes and Risk: Overlooked Variables in Formulating Public Policy on Soil Conservation and Water Quality--An Organized Symposium. NRED Staff Report AGES820129, 91 pp., Feb. 1982.

Request a copy from Lee Christenson, NRED/ERS/USDA, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30604.

CLAFFEY, BARBARA A. and STUCKER, THOMAS A. "The Food Stamp Program," Food Policy and Farm Programs Proceedings. Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 40-53, Mar. 1982.

CLAYTON, KENNETH C., STUCKER, THOMAS A., HARRIS, EVELYN, and MATSUMOTO, MASAO. An Economic Appraisal of User-Fee Alternatives for the Plant Variety Protection Office. NED Staff Report AGES811215, 27 pp., Dec. 1981.

Request a copy from Kenneth Clayton, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED/ERS/USDA, 120 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

COLLINS, JUDITH N. Characteristics of Projects Funded Under the Farmers Home Administration's Water and Waste Water Disposal Program. EDD Staff Report AGES811231, 28 pp., Jan. 1982.

Request a copy from Thomas Hady, Community Resource Branch, EDD/ ERS/ USDA, 460 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

COLLINS, JUDITH N. Recent Trends in Local Government Revenue. EDD Staff Report AGES811202, 50 pp., Jan. 1982.

Request a copy from Thomas Hady, Community Resource Branch, EDD/ ERS/ USDA, 460 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

DAUGHERTY, ARTHUR B., and YOUNG, C. EDWIN. Removal or Abandonment of Selected Conservation practices, 1975-77--A Report on a Landownership Follow-on Survey. NRED Staff Report AGES811208, 36 pp., Dec. 1981.

Request a copy from Arthur Daugherty, NRED/ERS/USDA, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

DEBRAAL, J. PETER, and MAJCHROWICZ, T. ALEXANDER. Foreign Ownership of U.S. Agricultural Land Through December 31, 1981. NRED Staff Report AGES820409, 65 pp., Apr. 1982.

Request a copy from Peter Debraal, Land Branch, NRED/ERS/USDA, 420 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

DOLL, JOHN P. and WIDDOWS, RICHARD. *The Value of Agricultural Land in the United States: Some Thoughts and Conclusions.* NED Staff Report AGES820323, 24 pp., Mar. 1982.

Request a copy from Paul Velde, Farm Sector Economics Branch, NED/ ERS/USDA, 245 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

ENGLISH, BURTON G., RAYMOND JOE SCHATZER, ROLAND K. ROBERTS, and EARL O. HEADY. *Potential Long-Term Agricultural Impacts of the Russian Grain Embargo*. Iowa State CARD Report No. 97, April 1981.

Request a copy of this report from Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, 578 East Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

FULTON, R. THOMAS, and BRAESTRUP, PETER. "The New Issues: Land, Water, and Energy," *The Wilson Quarterly*. Vol. 5, No. 3, Pp. 120-137, Summer 1981.

GADSON, KENNETH E., PRICE, J. MICHAEL, and SALATHE, LARRY E. *Food and Agricultural Policy Simulator (FAPSIM): Structural Equations and Variable Definitions*. NED Staff Report AGES820506, 394 pp., May 1982.

Request a copy from Kenneth Gadson, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED/ERS/USDA, 120 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

GILL, MOHINDER, and DARGAN, ANNETTE D. *Estimated Capacity of U.S. Ethanol Plants*. NED Staff Report AGES820210, 31 pp., Feb. 1982.

Request a copy from Mohinder Gill, Inputs and Finance Branch, NED/ ERS/USDA, 200 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

GROENEWEGEN, JOHN R., and CLAYTON, KENNETH C. "Agricultural Price Supports and Cost of Production," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. Vol.64, No. 2, May 1982.

GUITHER, HAROLD D. *How Illinois Dairy Farmers View Government and the Dairy Business*. Illinois Agricultural Economics 4522. January 1982.

Request this report from the author, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, 305 Mumford Hall, 1301 West Gregory Drive, Urbana, IL 61801.

HALLBERG, M. C. *Urban Society's Stake in Food and Agricultural Policy*.

Request this paper from the author, 101 Weaver Building, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

HAWKINS, M. H., S. S. LEAVITT, and L. LEIREN. Development and Operation of the Alberta Pork Producers Marketing Board.

Request a copy of this paper from M. Hawkins, Rural Economy, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2H1.

HEWETT. C. E., and W. T. GLIDDEN, JR. Market Pressures to Use Wood as an Energy.

Request this publication from Charles E. Hewett, Resource Policy Center, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755.

HEWETT, C. E., and T. E. HAMILTON (eds.). Forests in Demand: Conflicts and Solutions. ISBN 0 86569-106-1.

Order this publication (charge of $21.95) from Charles E. Hewett, Resource Policy Center, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755.

HEWETT, C. E., C. J. HIGH, N. MARSHALL, and R. WILDERMUTH. Wood Energy in the United States.

Request this publication from Charles E. Hewett, Resource Policy Center, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755.

HOUSE, ROBERT, OGG, CLAYTON, CLAYTON, KENNETH C., and JOHNSON, JAMES D. USDA Conservation Incentives Study. NED Staff Report AGES820104, 21 pp., Jan. 1982.

Request a copy from Kenneth Clayton, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED/ERS/USDA, 120 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

HOUSE, VERNE W. Shaping Public Policy--The Educator's Role. Westridge Publishing Co. 1981. 116 pp.

Order this book (charge of $9.95) from Westridge Publishing Company, Box 310, Bozeman, MT 59715.

HOUSE, VERNE W., KANE C. QUENEMOEN, and ANNE HILL. Alternative Methods of Maintaining Land in Agriculture. Montana State University Extension Bulletin 1262, December 1981, 37 pp.

Request this bulletin from Publications, Cooperative Extension Service, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT 59717.

JABARA, CATHY L. Wheat Import Demand Among Middle-Income Developing Countries: A Cross-Sectional Analysis. IED Staff Report AGES820212, 30 pp., Feb. 1982.

Request a copy from Vernon Roningen, Trade Policy Branch, IED/ERS/USDA, 324 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

JOHNSON, JAMES D., RIZZI, RICHARD W., SHORT, SARA D, and FULTON, R. THOMAS. Provisions of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981. AER-483, 23 pp., Mar. 1982.

Request a copy from Thomas Fulton, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED/ERS/USDA, 120 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

KELLEY, PAUL L. "Implications for World Food System Strategies With Special Regard to the Rural of the United States," Chapter in Current Trends in Soviet and East European Food Economy. Center for Continental European Agricultural and Economic Research of Justus-Liebig-Universitat, 1982.

Order this book (charge of $24.80) from Graduate School, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506.

KALBACHER, JUDITH Z. Women Farmers in America. ERS-679, 4 pp., Apr. 1982.

Request a copy from Judith Kalbacher, Human Resources Branch, EDD/ERS/USDA, 492 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

KESTER, ANNIE. The New Law of the Sea and the Japanese Fishing Industry: Implications for U.S. Agricultural Exports. IED Staff Report AGES820408, 32 pp., Apr. 1982.

Request a copy from Carmen Nohre, Asia Branch, IED/ERS/USDA, 350 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

KEUHN, JOHN A. and NELSON, MARLYS K. Transferability of Budgets for Community Services. EDD Staff Report AGES811116, 8 pp., Dec. 1981.

Request a copy from Marlys Nelson, Community Resource Branch, EDD/ERS/USDA, Department of Agricultural Economics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74074.

LANGLEY, JAMES A., WEN-YUAN, HUANG, and EARL O. HEADY. A Recursive Adaptive Hybrid Model for the Analysis of the National and Interregional Impacts of Three Alternative Agricultural Situations for 1981-83. Iowa State CARD Report No. 100, June 1981.

Request a copy of this report from Earl O. Heady or Jim Langley, Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

LONGEN, KATHRYN, and CLAFFEY, BARBARA A. An Alternative Approach to Food Assistance. ERS-669, 17 pp., Nov. 1981.

Request a copy from Kathryn Longen, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED/ERS/USDA, 120 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW Washington, DC 20250.

MADDEN, J. PATRICK, and HEATHER TISCHBIEN BAKER. An Agenda for Small Farms Research. January 1981.

Order (may be a charge) this booklet from National Rural Center, 1828 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

MANN, JITENDAR S. Food Demand Pattern in Thailand. IED Staff Report AGES820219, 23 pp., Feb. 1982.

Request a copy from Jitendar Mann, World Analysis Branch, IED/ERS/USDA, 342 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

MAYER, JOSEPH W. State Laws Relating to the Ownership of U.S. Land by Aliens and Business Entities. NRED Staff Report AGES811113, 65 pp., Nov. 1981.

Request a copy from Joseph Mayer, Land Branch, NRED/ERS/USDA, 420 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

McKINZIE, LANCE, PHILIP L. PAARLBERG, and IVAN P. HUERTA. Estimation of Response Surfaces in Dutch Compound Livestock Feeds. Working paper, January 1982, 32 pp.

Request this paper from Philip Paarlberg, Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907.

MOLNAR, JOSEPH J. Alabama Farm Operator Perspectives on a Changing Structure of Agriculture. Auburn University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 535. February 1982.

Request this bulletin from the author, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, 202 Comer Hall, Auburn University, AL 36849.

NELSON, PAUL E. School Food Service Programs and Commodity Market Support. USDA. ERS-676, March 1981.

Request a copy of this publication from Publications, ERS, USDA, Room 0054, South Building, 14th and Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250.

NIGHTINGALE, RAY W., URBAN, FRANCIS, and HANRAHAN, CHARLES. U.S. Foreign Assistance to Agriculture: A Proposed Redirection. IED Staff Report AGES820514, 37 pp., May 1982.

Request a copy from Ray Nightingale, Agricultural Development Branch, IED/ERS/USDA, 300 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

OGG, CLAYTON W., JOHNSON, JAMES D., and CLAYTON, KENNETH C. "A Policy Option for Targeting Soil Conservation Expenditures," Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 68-72, Mar.-Apr. 1982.

OLSON, KENT D., JAMES A. LANGLEY, and EARL O. HEADY. "Widespread Adoption of Organic Farming Practices: Estimated Impacts on U.S. Agriculture." Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 37(1982):41-45.

Request a reprint of this article from Earl O. Heady or Jim Langley, Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

PAARLBERG, PHILIP L., and PHILIP C. ABBOTT. Towards A Countervailing Power Theory of World Wheat Trade. Paper presented at International Trade Symposium, San Francisco, December 1981, 37 pp.

Request this paper from Philip Paarlberg, Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907.

PAARLBERG, PHILIP L., and FORREST D. HOLLAND. Discriminatory Pricing Under a U.S. Producer Board. ERS Staff Report, April 1982, 26 pp.

Request this paper from Philip Paarlberg, Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907.

PUTMAN, JOHN W., ACKERSON, KENNETH, and WITTER, SCOTT. Land Resource and Land Use Classification Concepts and Methods for Developing Countries. NRED Staff Report AGES820111, 36 pp., Jan. 1982.

Request a copy from John Putnam, Land Branch, NRED/ERS/USDA, 1405 South Harrison Rd., East Lansing, MI 48823.

SALATHE, LARRY E., PRICE, MICHAEL, and GADSON, KENNETH. "The Food and Agriculture Policy Simulator: FAPSIM," Agricultural Economics Research. Vol. 34, No. 2, Pp. 1-15, Apr. 1982.

Request a copy from Larry Salathe, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED/ERS/USDA, 120 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

SCHATZER, RAYMOND JOE, ROLAND K. ROBERTS, and EARL O. HEADY. Alternative Futures in U.S. Farm Size Structure, Productivity, Exports and Income: A Simulation. Iowa State CARD Report No. 99, April 1981.

Request a copy of this report from Center for Agricultural and Rural Development, 578 East Hall, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011.

SCHMIDT, STEPHEN C. Enlargement of the European Community: Plans, Concerns and Implications. Illinois Agricultural Economics AE 4524. 1982.

Request this report from S. C. Schmidt, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, 305 Mumford Hall, 1301 West Gregory Drive, Urbana, IL 61801.

SCHMIDT, STEPHEN C. Inter-COMECON Relations: Implications for U.S. Exports. Illinois Agricultural Economics AE 4519, 1982.

Request this report from S. C. Schmidt, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, 305 Mumford Hall, 1301 West Gregory Drive, Urbana, IL 61801.

SEELEY, RALPH, M. C. HALLBERG, and WON BAE KEIN. Resource Adjustments in Pennsylvania Agriculture in Response to Structural and Economic Changes. Pennsylvania State Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology Report No. 152. September 1981.

Request this report from M. C. Hallberg, 101 Weaver Building, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802.

SHARPLES, JERRY A. Analysis of a U.S. Corn Export Subsidy. IED Staff Report AGES820322, 9 pp., March 1982.

Request a copy from Jerry Sharples, Trade Policy Branch, IED/ERS/USDA, Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907.

SHARPLES, JERRY A. An Evaluation of U.S. Grain Reserve Policy, 1977-80. AER-481, 44 pp., Mar. 1982.

Request a copy from Ken Clayton, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, ERS/USDA, 120 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

SHARPLES, JERRY A. The Short-Run Elasticity of Demand for U.S. Wheat Exports. IED Staff Report AGES820406, 38 pp., Apr. 1982.

Request a copy from Jerry Sharples, Trade Policy Branch, IED/ERS/USDA, Department of agricultural Economics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907.

SHILLINGTON, THOMAS H. Rapid Growth Issues in Western Oil Shale Development: Uncertainty and Impact Mitigation. EDD Staff Report AGES11117, 72 pp., Dec. 1981.

Request a copy from Sybil Glascock, EDD/ERS/USDA, 460 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

SPITZE, R. G. F. "Analysis of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981." Illinois Research. Vol. 23(1982):12-14.

Request a copy of this article from the author, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, 305 Mumford Hall, 1301 West Gregory Drive, Urbana, IL 61801.

SUTTON, JOHN. Data Needs and Collection Methods for Analysis of Agricultural Production Potential. NRED Staff Report AGES820427, May 1982.

Request a copy from John Sutton, NRED/ERS/USDA, 1405 South Harrison Rd., East Lansing, MI 48823.

TODD, R. M. "Expanded Federal Crop Insurance: A Better Way for Taxpayers to Share Farmers' Risks," Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Quarterly Review. Winter 1982, pp. 18-28.

Contact Richard Todd at the Minneapolis Federal Reserve for further information.

TRAUB, LARRY G. Removal Impact Model: Theory and Application. NED Staff Report AGES820222, 26 pp., Feb. 1982.

Request a copy from Larry Traub, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED/ERS/USDA, 120 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

VAUGH, GERALD F. Agricultural Irrigation and Delaware Water Law. Delaware Extension Circular 140. November 1981.

Request a copy of this circular from G. F. Vaugh, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19711.

VAUGH, GERALD F. Dimensions of Delaware Agriculture. Delaware Extension Circular 139. 1982.

Request a copy of this circular from G. F. Vaugh, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19711.

VOGT, DONNA U., JABARA, CATHY L., and LINSE, DEE A. Barter of Agricultural Commodities. IED Staff Report AGES820410, 32 pp., Apr. 1982.

Request a copy from Donna Vogt, Trade Policy Branch, IED/ERS/USDA, 324 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

WALZER, NORMAN, and DAVID L. CHICOINE (eds.). Financing State and Local Governments in the 1980's: Issues and Trends. 1981. 306 pp.

Order this book (charge of $25) from Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain, Inc., 1278 Massachusetts Avenue, Harvard Square, Cambridge, MA 02138.

WEIMER, JON P. Factors Affecting Nutrient Intake of the Elderly. NED Staff Report AGES820112, 22 pp., Jan. 1982.

Request a copy from Jon Weimer, Food and Agricultural Policy Branch, NED/ERS/USDA, 120 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washingon, DC 20250.

WEISGERBER, PAT. Canada's Competitive Position in the North American Hog Industry. IED Staff Report AGES811216, 26 pp., Dec. 1981.

Request a copy from Pat Weisgerber, North America and Oceania Branch, IED/ERS/USDA, 360 GHI Bldg., 500 12th St., SW, Washington, DC 20250.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1982-360-930:ERS-1120

University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign
Agricultural Experiment Station
Mumford Hall
Urbana, Illinois 61801

R. G. Cragle, Director
Publication

Penalty for Private Use, $300

POSTAGE PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE
AGR 101

U.S.MAIL

30 00 00 000327
FREDERICK J. NELSON
ESCS, NED
RM 112 GHI BLDG
WASHINGTON, DC 20250